

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-2 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 3-23 are present for examination.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blinn et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,897,622) (hereinafter Blinn). Claims 3 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, further in view of Catapult, Inc. ("Microsoft Word 97: Step by Step", 1997) (hereinafter Catapult). Claims 5-6 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, further in view of Jaakkola et al. ("sgrep – search a file for a structured pattern") (hereinafter Jaakkola).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, further in view of Hikida et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,737,737) (hereinafter Hikida). Claims 7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, further in view of Jaakkola, further in view of Parry et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,077,085) (hereinafter Parry). Claims 8 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Blinn, further in view of Jaakkola, further in view of Costales ("C from A to Z", 1985). Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn.

With respect to claims 3-23, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 22, as amended, recites a method of editing a plurality of mark-up language structured documents and generating a resultant document reflecting the edit results, comprising the steps of:

“(a) acquiring at least a first and a second mark-up language structured document in a document edit system;

(b) extracting at least a first and second element in the first mark-up language structured document and a third and fourth element in the second mark-up language structured document using an element edit statement which specifies the first and third elements to be extracted by a first common identifier or tag for mark-up language structured documents and specifies the

second and fourth elements to be extracted by a second common identifier or tag for mark-up language structured documents, wherein the elements are extracted while the relationship of the first and second elements and the third and fourth elements is maintained; and

(c) generating said resultant document, wherein said resultant document includes an arrangement of elements extracted in step (b) such that said first and third elements are arranged together with each being arranged in association with said second and fourth elements respectively.” (Emphasis Added)

A method of editing a plurality of mark-up language structured documents and generating a resultant document reflecting the edit results including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages of: (i) at least a **first** and a **second** mark-up language structured document are acquired, at least a first and a second element are extracted from the first mark-up language structured document, at least a third and a fourth element are extracted from the second mark-up language structured document, and a **resultant document** is generated that includes an arrangement of the **first, second, third, and fourth** elements that were extracted; (ii) an element edit statement specifies the first and third elements to be extracted by a **first common identifier** or tag for mark-up language structured documents and specifies the second and fourth elements to be extracted by a **second common identifier** or tag for mark-up language structured documents; (iii) the elements are extracted while the relationship of the first and second elements and the third and fourth elements is **maintained**; and (iv) the resultant document is generated such that the first and third elements are **arranged together** with each being **arranged in association with** the second and fourth elements respectively.

An example of a use of such a method is illustrated in applicant’s FIG. 11. As shown in the example of FIG. 11, a document edit system 30 acquires a first input document 50 and a second input document 52. In the example, an element edit statement such as, for example, %<title>,%<name> specifies a first element to be extracted from the first input document 50 and a third element to be extracted from the second input document 52 by a first common tag <title>, and specifies a second element to be extracted from the first input document 50 and a fourth element to be extracted from the second input document 52 by a second common tag <name>. Then, in the example, the elements are extracted from the first input document 50 and the second input document 52, and an output document 54 is generated in which the first

and third elements are arranged together in a column labeled “title” and are each arranged in association with the second and fourth elements respectively that are under the column “name”. Also, as shown in the example, the method allows for maintaining a relationship between the first and second elements and between the third and fourth elements even after they are extracted from the input documents 50 and 52. (Applicant’s Specification; page 7, line 21 to page 9, line 6; FIG. 11, references 30, 50, 52, 54).

Blinn neither discloses nor suggests a method including the above-quoted features for at least the following four reasons: (i) the method of Blinn does **not** allow for extracting elements from both a first mark-up language structured document and a **second** mark-up language structured document to generate a resultant document including elements extracted from **both** the first and second mark-up language structured documents; (ii) the method of Blinn does **not** allow for an element edit statement to have a **first common identifier** or tag for mark-up language structured documents to specify elements to be extracted from **both** a first and second mark-up language structured document and to have a **second common identifier** or tag for mark-up language structured documents to specify elements to be extracted from **both** a first and second mark-up language structured document; (iii) the method of Blinn does **not** allow for **extracting two** elements from a mark-up language structured document using an element edit statement while **maintaining** a relationship between the two elements; and (iv) the method of Blinn does **not** allow for generating a resultant document in which elements from two mark-up language structured documents that are extracted by using a **common identifier** or tag are **arranged together**, and are **arranged in association with** other elements extracted from a same mark-up language structured document respectively. Each of the preceding four reasons will now be examined in greater detail.

First, the method of Blinn does **not** allow for extracting elements from both a first mark-up language structured document and a **second** mark-up language structured document to generate a resultant document including elements extracted from **both** the first and second mark-up language structured documents. In one embodiment of the method of Blinn, the page processor 140 retrieves and parses a template from the HTML structures 126 to form a

HTML page for display on the browser 122. (Blinn; FIG. 3A; column 10, lines 18-23). In another embodiment of the method of Blinn, the template parser 144 obtains a template from the HTML structures 126, parses this template to create a syntax tree and delivers the resulting syntax tree to the page processor 140 to create HTML for display on the browser 122. (Blinn; FIG. 3B; column 10, lines 51-55). Thus, in both embodiments of the method of Blinn, a single HTML template is used to form an HTML page, and the method of Blinn does not extract elements from both a first and second mark-up language structured document to generate a resultant document including elements extracted from both the first and second mark-up language structured documents.

Second, the method of Blinn does not allow for an element edit statement to have a first common identifier or tag for mark-up language structured documents to specify elements to be extracted from both a first and second mark-up language structured document and to have a second common identifier or tag for mark-up language structured documents to specify elements to be extracted from both a first and second mark-up language structured document. In the method of Blinn, a template provides a query name to the query module 142, the query module passes the query name to the database module 127, the database module 127 uses the query name to retrieve the query from the database 121 and passes the query to the database 121, the database returns the query result to the database module 127, the database module 127 returns an access object having the query results to the query module 142, and the page processor 140 obtains the access object from the query module 142 and formats the query data to prepare HTML for display on the browser 122. (Blinn; FIG. 3A; column 10, lines 27-42).

Thus, in the method of Blinn, a query name is used only in the template in which it is located, and is not used as a common identifier to extract elements from both a first and a second mark-up language structured document. Indeed, a query name in a template cannot even be used to extract an element from a mark-up language structured document, but can only be used to perform a query operation in a database, and then the result of the query operation is simply displayed in a HTML page. (Blinn; column 10, lines 15-45). Moreover, a method including the above-quoted features allows for specifying elements to be extracted by

a common identifier or tag that is for mark-up language structured documents and, as a result, searching can be performed for the common identifier or tag to extract an element by searching a mark-up language structured document. In contrast, Blinn merely discloses searching in a **database** for a search result to a query, and Blinn does not disclose or suggest the ability to search a mark-up language structured document using a common identifier or tag for mark-up language structured documents to extract an element.

Third, the method of Blinn does not allow for extracting two elements from a mark-up language structured document using an element edit statement while maintaining a relationship between the two elements. The Examiner points to Blinn (column 10, lines 15-45) as states that, “SQL is used to retrieve information and the structured relationship is maintained”. However, in the method of Blinn, SQL is used to retrieve information from a **database** and not to extract elements from a mark-up language structured document. (Blinn; columns 10-11).

Fourth, the method of Blinn does not allow for generating a resultant document in which elements from two mark-up language structured documents that are extracted by using a common identifier or tag are arranged together, and are arranged in association with other elements extracted from a same mark-up language structured document respectively. The Examiner points to Blinn (column 10, lines 40-65) and states that, “a syntax tree is used to produce an ordered template-based arrangement of the HTML content”. However, in the method of Blinn, a syntax tree is simply an internal representation of a single input template file. (Blinn; column 10, lines 59-60). As a consequence, a syntax tree is not a resultant document in which elements from two mark-up language structured documents are arranged together, but is only a parsed version of a single template.

Therefore, independent claim 22, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23, as amended, recites a method of editing a plurality of mark-up language structured documents each containing a plurality of structured elements and generating a resultant document reflecting the edit results with features similar to features of a

method of editing a plurality of mark-up language structured documents and generating a resultant document reflecting the edit results of independent claim 22. Therefore, independent claim 23 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 22 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 5, 2005

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252